REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,476,863 to *Silverbrook.*

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants respectfully submit that *Silverbrook* does not anticipate the present invention.

Claims 1-6 were amended to better clarify the invention and not for the purposes of patentability.

Accordingly, claims 1-6 are pending for further consideration.

All Claims are Allowable

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Silverbrook.*

This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the following arguments.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 includes features not found or

taught in *Silverbrook.* Specifically, independent claim 1 recites a combination of features

including at least "displaying a plurality of images arranged in a two-dimensional array on a

display screen wherein images arranged at least in a one-dimensional direction in succession

among said plurality of images are images processed states of which are gradually changed in at

least one attribute of image processing . . . performing image verification based on the thus

displayed plurality of images." Applicants respectfully submit that at least these features are not

taught or suggested by *Silverbrook.*

Silverbrook discloses a device which includes a card reading machine and a printer,

attached to a CCD video camera. A card, the size of a credit card, is inserted into the reading

machine. On one face of the card is found a visual representation of an effect the card will have

on a sensed video image. The camera is capable of transforming the sensed video image

substantially in accordance with the transformation of a standard image comprising the visual

representation of the card and the transformation of the sensed video image onto a printed output

of the printer. See the Abstract and col. 1, lines 15-21 and 55-60 of *Silverbrook*. On the other

side of the card is an array of black dots called borderlines and clockmarks which make-up a

scripted image processing language called "VARK". In other words, *Silverbrook* discloses a

method and apparatus for adding effects to sensed video images and printing them onto paper.

The Office Action states that the "two-dimensional array" feature of the present invention

is found at col. 75, lines 66 to col. 76, line 4; the "one-dimensional direction" feature of the

present invention is found at col. 75, lines 66 to col. 76, line 4; and the change of "images

processed states" feature of the present invention is found at col. 75, lines 66 to col. 76, line 4 of

Silverbrook. On the contrary, *Silverbrook* (col. 75, lines 66 to col. 76, line 4) defines a plastic

card with an array of black dots called borderlines and clockmarks. The dots make-up the

scripted image processing language called the VARK language. See col. 12, lines 5-65 and Fig.

77 of *Silverbrook*. As discussed in col. 75, line 66 to col. 76, line 4 of *Silverbrook*, the position

of a clockmark is verified after its initial position is estimated. The pixels surrounding the

estimated clockmark position assist reconstruction of a continuous signal to determine the exact

position of the clockmark. *Silverbrook* states that this is a one-dimensional process that needs to

be performed twice. Thus, *Silverbrook* merely describes a plastic Artcard that stores the VARK

language (a black dot array) on it so that image effects may be applied to sensed video images.

See col. 12, lines 5-65 of *Silverbrook*.

Silverbrook does not describe displaying a plurality of images on a display screen with the gradual change of a singular attribute distributed in a one-dimensional direction. Instead, *Silverbrook* shows an array of black dots located on a card. The dots are not displayed on a display screen and are not gradually changed in a one-dimensional direction. Further, the sensed video image, that is transformed by the language on the card, is not displayed as a plurality of images on a display screen with the gradual change of a singular attribute of the image distributed in a one-dimensional direction. Applicants respectfully submit that the conflicting descriptions and completely different features and functions described in *Silverbrook* and the present invention are not compatible and cannot be reconciled.

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under § 102(e) should be withdrawn because *Silverbrook* does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1.

Additionally, it is further respectfully submitted that dependent claim 2 is also allowable insofar as it recites the patentable combinations of features recited in independent claim 1, as well as reciting additional features that further distinguish over the applied art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that independent claim 3 includes features not found or taught in

Silverbrook. Specifically, claim 3 recites a combination of features including at least "image processed states of which are gradually changed in at least one attribute of image processing and which are arranged at least in a one-dimensional direction are displayed in succession on a display screen of the display device." Applicants respectfully submit that at least these features are not taught or suggested by *Silverbrook*.

Contrary to the Office Action, *Silverbrook* does not disclose the features of "images processed states . . . which are gradually changed in at least one attribute . . . and which are arranged at least in a one-dimensional direction are displayed in succession on a display screen of the display device," as recited in claim 3. As previously mentioned, *Silverbrook* does not process images that are gradually changed in at least one attribute and arranged at least in a one-dimensional direction in succession on a display screen. Nowhere in *Silverbrook* are such images varied, arranged, displayed, or even mentioned.

The Office Action states that the display device for displaying the thus read image is anticipated by *Silverbrook* at col. 9, lines 1-67. However, this citation discusses the functions of the Artcam Central Processor chip which is referred to as the "heart" of the *Silverbrook* device. The Artcam Central Processor chip controls the functions of the peripheral components, but does not display anything itself. The Artcam Central Processor chip is not a display device and cannot display the claimed processed images. Applicants respectfully submit that "images processed states" arranged in a one-dimensional direction, displaying repetitive film images with a single changed attribute (*e.g.*, hue), does not correlate to the functions of the Artcam Central Processor chip as stated in col. 9, lines 1-67 of *Silverbrook*. For at least the reasons above-

mentioned, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under § 102(e) should be withdrawn because *Silverbrook* does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 3.

Additionally, it is further respectfully submitted that dependent claim 4 is also allowable insofar as it recites the patentable combinations of features recited in independent claim 3, as well as reciting additional features that further distinguish over the applied art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Similarly, Applicants submit that independent claims 5 and 6 include features not found or taught in *Silverbrook*. Specifically, "displaying a plurality of images arranged in a two-dimensional array on a display screen wherein said plurality of images are processed in one frame in different states to each other and arranged at least in a one-dimensional direction in succession are images processed states which are gradually changed in at least one attribute of image processing" and "wherein a plurality of images which are processed said read image in one frame in different states to each other are arranged in a two-dimensional array on a display screen of the display device, and wherein images processed states of which are gradually changed in at least one attribute of image processing and which are arranged at least in a one-dimensional direction are displayed in succession on the display screen of the display device," as recited in claims 5 and 6, respectively.

Contrary to the Office Action, *Silverbrook* does not disclose the features recited in claims 5 and 6 above. The Office Action states that the above-mentioned features in claims 5 and 6 are anticipated by *Silverbrook*. The Office Action also states that the arguments for claims 5 and 6 "are addressed above," referring to its arguments for claims 1 and 3. Applicants respectfully

submit that the Office Action's arguments for claims 1 and 3 are likewise unconvincing for claims 5 and 6. Rather, it is the Applicants' reasoned arguments for claims 1 and 3 that should convince the Examiner that claims 5 and 6 are allowable as written. Accordingly, approval of independent claims 5 and 6 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Date: August 16, 2004

Customer No. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel.: (202) 739-3000

MJB/DEC

1-WA/2170437.2